OPD_FAV_SB 1048 Uploaded by: Flores, Ricardo

Position: FAV



POSITION ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION

BILL: SB 1048 - Criminal Procedure - Office of the Public Defender - Definition

of Serious Offense

POSITION: SUPPORT

DATE: March 12, 2020

When, several years ago, the General Assembly transferred eligibility determinations from the Public Defender's Office to the Judiciary, a move we supported, the Assembly mandated that court commissioners conduct eligibility determinations for indigent persons facing a term of incarceration.

This comports with the Constitution's 6th Amendment and Supreme Court law that establishes the right to counsel for indigent persons who are facing criminal proceedings that subject them to *any possible time* behind bars, whether just one day, or a lifetime. Incarceration is the sole basis for the scope of our representation, not any other aspect of the law, whether fines, fees or other collateral consequences.

In the early 70's, when the public defender statute was codified, for some reason our representation mandate was delineated in reference to whether someone was facing a "serious crime," presumably to limit our representing persons with petty offenses, for which it might have been thought they didn't need an attorney. The "serious offense" definition included reference to not only a term of incarceration "for more than three months," but also included fines of "more than \$500."

While we have always represented persons to the full extent of our constitutional obligations, this part of our statute needs updating for two reasons.

First, the "more than three month" threshold is arbitrary and unconstitutional. While we have never recognized the threshold in practice to deny representation, we should eliminate it from our code.

Second, the monetary prong of the definition seems to saddle us with the responsibility to represent people the Constitution doesn't require us to represent. Because more and more offenses that once carried incarceration penalties are being revised to only include monetary fines, we do not want to continue to give the false impression that our

Agency must represent persons in fine-only cases. Indeed, our resources are best focused on more serious offenses.

* * *

For all of the above-stated reasons, we urge a favorable vote on SB 1048.

Miller_FAV_SB1048
Uploaded by: Senator Miller, Senator Miller

Position: FAV

THOMAS V. MIKE MILLER, JR.
PRESIDENT EMERITUS
27th Legislative District



Annapolis Address
11 Bladen Street, Suite 1 East
Annapolis, Maryland 21401-1991
410-841-3700 · 301-858-3700
800-492-7122 Ext. 3700

District Addresses
Prince George's County
P. O. Box 219
8808 Old Branch Avenue
Clinton, Maryland 20735
301-868-6931
Calvert County
P. O. Box 364
Dunkirk, Maryland 20754
410-257-4400

Testimony of Thomas V. Mike Miller, Jr. Senate Bill 1048 – Office of the Public Defender – Definition of Serious Offense

Chairman Smith and Committee Members:

Senate Bill 1048 is a technical bill that alters the definition of a serious offense for purposes of the Office of the Public Defender's representation. Specifically, this bill will remove certain requirements for misdemeanors under the definition of a serious offense.

Currently, a serious offense includes a misdemeanor or offense punishable by confinement for more than three months or a fine of more than \$500. Under this legislation a serious offense will now include a misdemeanor or offense punishable by confinement to be in line with the representation required of the Office of the Public Defender.

Senate Bill 1048 will allow the Public Defender to focus its resources on the most necessary cases. For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Judicial Proceedings Committee for a favorable report on Senate Bill 1048.